

Remarks

Claims 1 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for failing to claim elements essential to the invention. In particular, the Examiner states that it is essential to the invention of claims 1 and 15 that a message is received that stops all flooding. In response, claims 1 and 15 were amended to include this limitation.

Claims 6 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for failing to claim elements essential to the invention. In particular, the Examiner states that claims 6 and 17 need elements directed towards transmitting a RT_NEED message, determining identification of senders of a flood message, and comparing identities of the senders of the flood message. In response, the last two limitations were added to claims 6 and 17. The Applicants point out, however, that the limitation of transmitting a RT_NEEDED message is not necessary. More particularly, claims 6 and 17 claim the steps of transceiver 700 functioning as a node aiding in route discovery between two differing nodes. This situation is described with respect to the description of FIG. 9. As is plainly evident, transmitting a RT_NEED message is not performed by transceiver 700 when functioning as a node aiding in route discovery between two differing nodes.

Claims 4 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for failing to claim elements essential to the invention. In particular, the Examiner states that claims 4 and 16 need elements directed towards transmitting a RT_NEED message, receiving a flood stop message, and receiving a Route_INFO message. The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Applicants wish to point out to Examiner Hu, that claims 4 and 16 are directed towards operation of transceiver 700 when functioning as a node, a route to which is trying to be discovered. This situation is described with respect to the description of FIG. 10. As is plainly evident, the elements deemed necessary by Examiner Hu are not performed by transceiver 700 when functioning as a node, a route to which is trying to be discovered.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. As the Applicant has overcome all substantive rejections given by the Examiner the Applicant contends that this Amendment, with the above discussion,

overcomes the Examiner's rejections to the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter. Finally, please charge any fees (including extension of time fees) or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502117.

Respectfully Submitted,
Calcev, ET AL.

By: /Kenneth Haas/
Reg. No. 42,614
Phone: (847) 576-6937
FAX: (847) 576-3750